

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 9-11, 14, 16-24 are now pending, with claim 9 being the sole independent claim. Independent claim 9 and dependent claims 16-19 have been amended. Claim 15 has been cancelled and claim 24 has been added. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in the Abstract, and at paragraph [0017] of U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0282795A1 (i.e., the original application). No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed September 3, 2009, the Examiner has objected to claims 9-23 because the term "if" used in Claim 9 allegedly rendered these claims indefinite. Claim 9 has been amended to remove the objected term. The Examiner has objected to claims 15 and 19 because they depend from cancelled claim 12. Applicant has now cancelled claim 15 and amended claim 19 to depend from Claim 9. It is respectfully submitted that the objections have now been overcome.

Claim 9 has been amended to more clearly point out the present invention. Support for the amended language may be found, for example, in Figs. 1 and 3 and associated paragraphs (e.g., paragraph [0014]) illustrating the exchange of published information or web content over the Internet in accordance with the principles of the invention.

New claim 24 has been added. Support for this claim may be found in paragraph [0018].

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9-11 and 14-23 under 37 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner explained that the limitation of "third party trigger events" is not defined by the claim and that the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree. Therefore, a person ordinarily skilled in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim 9 is now amended by replacing “third party trigger events” with “events” as the specification described various examples of specified events such as, for example, “news, keywords, and change in prices or total users in a specific group.” See paragraph [0018] of the original application. This amended language eliminates any confusion over the meaning of the term “trigger” in the context of this invention but focuses on the occurrence of an event explained in the present application.

Claims 9-11 and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* (US 2002/018420 A1) and further in view of *Crandall et al.* (US 6321228 B1).

*Ueda* discloses a location-based information intermediation and acquisition method in which an intermediation computer system on a network intermediates location-based information provided on the network and synchronizes with a mobile communication terminal (see paragraph [0018] of *Ueda*). The intermediation computer system transmits to the mobile communication terminal an information source and distribution condition list that associates a location on the network of an information source having the location-based information and corresponding to specific search conditions with distribution conditions that include a distribution area of the location-based information. (see paragraph [0019] of *Ueda*). In contrast, the present invention discloses an information exchange system configured to receive and monitor web-based content uploaded by publishers and to store user-input queries for content as static queries. The information exchange disseminates the content to interested users when the content matches the static queries, together with additional information such as, for example, advertisements and/or alerts. Advantageously, the inventive system serves as a single location which is capable of accepting, aggregating and redistributing all published information sources, as well as providing a fast and reliable control and query based real-time dissemination of such information, and

facilitates real-time market pricing for the purchase and sale of information. See, e.g., paragraphs [0007] and [0010] of the present application.

“Content” is defined by the Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary to mean “the principal substance (as written matter, illustrations, or music) offered by a World Wide Web site.” The presently amended independent Claim 9 recites that the inventive method requires, among other things, the step of “receiving by an information exchange new web-based content uploaded from information providers or administrators, the information exchange being configured for receiving web-based content from web-based network sources.” Accordingly, the data or information operated by the location-based information intermediation and acquisition method of *Ueda* clearly does not disclose or teach at least this limitation.

*Crandall* discloses a system and method that enable Internet users to access selected records retrieved from result sets that are derived from earlier search queries, and which tracks and ranks selected records that users deemed valuable to a search query. However, *Crandall* also does not disclose at least the limitation of “receiving by an information exchange new web-based content uploaded from information providers or administrators, the information exchange being configured for receiving web-based content from web-based network sources.”

It is respectfully submitted that *Ueda* and *Crandall*, either singly or in combination, do not disclose or teach all of the limitations of the presently amended claim 9.

Accordingly, each of dependent claims 10-11, 14, 16-24 is patentable over the cited references for the same aforementioned reasons.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 are therefore requested, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Edward M. Weisz/  
Edward M. Weisz  
Reg. No. 37,257  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: March 2, 2010